DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 828 SP 013 073

AUTHOR Schurr, Terry; Sciara, Frank
TITLE The ISTA/RCPSS Professional Education Inservice Needs Assessment.
PUB DATE Nov 77
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Indiana Educational Research Association (Indianapolis, Indiana, November 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Class Management; Course Content; Economic Status; Individualized Instruction; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Needs Assessment; *Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Assignment

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to develop an instrument for assessing the inservice needs of teachers and to obtain an overview of their perceived needs. This instrument was proposed to be a single, convenient format for gathering data that could be used with teachers at all levels of elementary and secondary teaching. A sixty-one item questionnaire was submitted to 2,265 teachers. A five-step model for instruction--objective, specification, preassessment, instructional planning, instruction and evaluation--was used as the initial conceptual scheme for grouping the items. Because of the overlap of skills required for the preassessment and evaluation steps, items related to these steps were combined into a single evaluation category. Items not directly related to one of the steps were categorized into one of three additional categories: classroom management, instructional resources, or communication. The questionnaire also provided for dividing teachers themselves by grade level taught, socioeconomic status of pupils, and subject matter taught. Data obtained from this instrument is presented in tabular form in this document. A sample of the questionnaire is appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dr. Terry Schurr
Dr. M. Kay Stickle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

ED161828

RESUME

The ISTA/RCPSS Professional Education In-Service Needs Assessment

Through the cooperative efforts of the Ball State University Resource Center for Public School Services (RCPSS) and the Indiana State Teachers Association (ISTA), an instrument with 61 items was designed, validated, and utilized for the collection of needs for in-service education, as expressed by 2,265 teachers, representing 7% of the ISTA membership list in Indiana.

Responses were analyzed according to the assignment (grade and subject matter taught) and the socioeconomic characteristics of the students taught.

Twelve factors were selected to classify the items in the survey instrument through a factor analysis approach. These factors are as follows:

Factor	Label
I	Evaluation: General
II	Communication
III	Instruction: Structured
IV	Instruction: General Methodology
V	Behavioral Problem Management
VI	Classroom Administration
VII	Instruction: Analysis
VIII	Instruction: Resources
IX	Instruction: Innovation
X	Instruction: Individualized
XI	Testing
XII	Interacting with Culturally Different

Areas of the highest expressed needs by teachers at all levels were in Behavioral Problem Management (V) and Instruction: Individualized (X). Rated second highest were the areas of Instruction: Structured (III) and Instruction: General Methodology (IV). Consistently rated the lowest were Evaluation: General (I), Testing (XI), and Interacting with Culturally Different (XII). The remaining labels fell in the middle of the distribution.

SP013 073

The authors recommend that before in-service education projects for teachers are instituted by decision makers, teachers needs should be assessed utilizing a valid instrument such as the one presented in this study.

THE ISTA/RCPSS PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

IN SERVICE NEEDS ASSESSMENT

PRESENTERS: DR. TERRY SCHURR
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR RESEARCH COMPUTING
BALL STATE UNIVERSITY

DR. FRANK SCIARA
DIRECTOR, INSTITUTE FOR THE PREPARATION
OF TEACHERS OF THE DISADVANTAGED
BALL STATE UNIVERSITY

COMMITTEE: MR. BILL COOK, ISTA
MR. DALE HARRIS, ISTA
DR. JAMES MITCHELL, BSU
DR. MARJORIE QUIMBY, BSU
DR. TERRY SCHURR, BSU
DR. FRANK SCIARA, BSU
DR. FRANK SPARZO, BSU
DR. KAY STICKLE, BSU

SP013 073

A PAPER PRESENTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
INDIANA EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
INDIANAPOLIS, NOVEMBER, 1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

BACKGROUND 1

PROCEDURE 2

Instrumentation 2
Sample 3
Analysis 4

RESULTS 6

Item Groupings 6
Individual Items 8
Evaluation 8
Communication 8
Instruction 8
Classroom Management 9
Objectives 9
Instructional Resources 10
Instructional Planning 10

DISCUSSION 11

APPENDIXES

One 15
Two 25

TABLES

I. Results of the TPE Survey - All Teachers
II. Item Loadings Greater Than .30 For Each of the 12 Related Factors
III. Overall Means of the Item Clusters and a Breakdown by Teacher Assignment, Student Socioeconomic Level and Subject Matter Assignment for Junior and Senior High Teachers
IV. Breakdown of the Evaluation Items by Teacher Assignment, Student Socioeconomic Level and Subject Matter Assignment for Junior and Senior High Teachers
V. Breakdown of Communication Items by Teacher Assignment, Student Socioeconomic Level and Subject Matter for Junior and Senior High Teachers

TABLES (cont'd)

VI. Breakdown of Instruction Items by Teacher Assignment, Student Socioeconomic Level, and Subject Matter Assignment for Junior and Senior High Teachers

VII. Breakdown of the Classroom Management Items by Teacher Assignment, Student Socioeconomic Level, and Subject Matter Assignment for Junior and Senior High Teachers

VIII. Breakdown of the Objectives Items by Teacher Assignment, Student Socioeconomic Level, and Subject Matter Assignment for Junior and Senior High Teachers

IX. Breakdown of Instructional Resources Items by Teacher Assignment, Student Socioeconomic Level and Subject Matter Assignment for Junior and Senior High Teachers

X. Breakdown of the Instructional Planning Items by Teacher Assignment, Student Socioeconomic Level and Subject Matter Assignment for Junior and Senior High Teachers

BACKGROUND

A recent change of emphasis by teacher educators has been to in-service education as witnessed by the rash of articles, books, reports, newsletters, and the shifting of federal resources from pre-service to in-service education. Burdin[1] cites a number of causative factors including a gradual decline in K - 12 enrollment, less turnover of teachers, teacher corps and teacher center legislation. All point to more emphasis on improved staff renewal.

While teacher groups move towards more input and control of in-service education, often citing the lack of relevance by colleges and universities, higher education's response, for the most part, has been one of cautious attempts to maintain the status quo. The struggle for control appears to point the way to a greater sharing of responsibility, cooperative planning, on-site programs, and a change of offerings and formats.

Edelfelt[2] has identified in-service education of teachers as the priority of the next decade. Such a challenge must be met with careful planning, for Rubin[3] concluded that the professional education of teachers has not been taken seriously and that it lacks a systematic methodology.

According to Agne and Ducharme[4], the usual university response to client needs for in-service education is shortsighted. Evidence for this view is found in a report by Brimm and Tollett[5] which stated that the general feeling of teachers in their study was that most in-service training was not responsive to their needs.

A requirement to differentiate between the needs of beginning and experienced teachers is cited in a study by Ingersoll[6] in his study of in-service education for teachers.

Too often in-service programs for teachers are determined by school administrators or university officials, rather than from the perceived needs of the teachers.

The purpose of this study was to develop an instrument for assessing the in-service needs of teachers and to obtain an overview of their perceived needs. Desired was a single, convenient format for gathering such data which could be utilized with teachers at all levels--elementary, junior high, and senior high school. The study was a joint effort by staff and members of the Indiana State Teachers Association and Ball State faculty working through the University's Resource Center for Public School Services. Through their cooperative efforts, such an instrument was designed, tested, and completed by over 2,000 teachers in Indiana in the spring and summer of 1977. Financing was provided by the Ball State University Resource Center for Public School Services and the Indiana State Teachers Association.

PROCEDURE

Instrumentation

Input regarding the selection and construction of the items came from four sources: other questionnaires constructed for the same purpose, I.S.T.A. committee members, B.S.U. committee members and responses from a small number of teachers enrolled in graduate education classes at Ball State University. Glaser's five step model for instruction--Objective Specification, Pre-Assessment, Instructional Planning, Instruction and Evaluation--was used as the initial conceptual scheme for grouping the items.

It became apparent while attempting to group the items that the model was not sufficient for the categorization of all items. Because of the overlap of skills required for the Pre-Assessment and Evaluation steps, items related to these steps were combined into a single Evaluation category. Items not directly related to one of the steps were categorized into one of three additional categories: Classroom Management, Instructional Resources or Communication. In some instances, additional items were constructed to provide a more comprehensive coverage of the seven categories. This procedure resulted in seven categories, four from Glaser's model and the three additional ones.

Sample

The data were provided by 2,265 teachers selected by systematic sampling from the Indiana State Teachers Association address listing. These respondents represented approximately 60% of the teachers who received the questionnaire and 7% of the membership list. The initial questionnaire was mailed in May, 1977, and a follow-up questionnaire was sent in August.

Tabulation of the responses to the background questions indicated that 234 school corporation were represented in the survey. Sixty-three percent of the respondents were female and 47% were male. Percentages of those teaching in lower elementary (LO)[7], upper elementary (UP), junior high or middle school (JR) and senior high (SR) were 29%, 20%, 20%, and 31% respectively. The breakdown of junior high or middle school and senior high teachers by major subject matter assignment showed 26% in physical, biological and/or mathematical sciences (PB), 13% in social sciences (SS), 19% in humanities (HM), 7% in fine arts (FA), 28% in applied arts (AA), and 4% in a miscellaneous category consisting predominately of

special education teachers (OT). The distribution for the four socioeconomic categories, "mostly lower" (ML), "about evenly distributed between lower and middle" (LM), "mostly middle" (MM), and "about evenly distributed between middle and upper" (MU), were 12%, 40%, 39%, and 8%.

Analysis

One analysis consisted of computing the mean of each item and inspecting the relative values of the item means. The results, grouped by category, for the entire sample are shown in Table I which is found in Appendix One. Results from subdividing the sample by grade level, by student body type and by junior or middle and high school major subject matter areas are shown in Tables IV through X. Each table contains one of the seven item categories. In all tables the values on the vertical axis are means and the numbers in the columns identify the questions.

A second prodecure was to group items into sets, based on results of an exploratory factor analysis. Means for the nonoverlapping item sets were compared for the various sample subdivisions. The analysis was also used to examine the instrument's construct validity. Results of the factor analysis are shown in Table II. Means obtained from the item averages for each of the 12 identified sets are shown in Table III.

Estimates of item commonalities for the factor analysis were obtained through iteration. Both principal axis and maximum likelihood factoring procedures were employed. As shown by the factor loadings in Table II, varimax rotation yielded very similar results for the two factoring procedures. Maximum likelihood factor loadings are shown in parentheses. Only loadings near or greater then .30 are reported.

Selecting 12 factors to represent the structure of the data was somewhat arbitrary.[8] The conventional procedure in the principal axis

procedure of using factors with eigen values greater than 1.00 suggested only ten factors. However, using statistical tests available for the maximum likelihood procedure indicated additional factors were needed. Inspection of successive factoring results showed that nine factors confirmed fairly well the original categorization of the items and that additional factors subdivided certain item categories. The rationale for retaining 12 item groupings was that clusters of skills resulting from further factoring were conceptually meaningful and that in the exploratory stage of the project the investigators did not wish to lose potentially useful information.

Two Factors, I and VIII, showed an item grouping identical to an a priori category. Pairs of Factors III and IV, V and VI, and IX and X each subdivided a category into two relatively distinct subsets. Factors II and VII involved more than one item from two different categories, Factor IX was a subset of Factor I and Factor XII was a small factor containing two items from different categories.

As shown in Table II (see Appendix One), Factor I (Items 44 through 55) was the original Evaluation category and Factor VIII (Items 40 through 43) was the Instructional Resources Category. Factors III (Items 26 through 31) and IV (Items 32 through 39) divided Instruction, Factors V (Items 6, 7, 8, 9 and 15) and VII (items 1, 2, 4 and 5) divided Classroom Management and Factors IX (Items 21 through 26) and X (Items 16 through 21) divided the Instructional Planning. Factor II included items from Communication (Items 56 through 61) and Evaluation (Items 51, 52 and 55). Factor VI included items from Objectives (Items 10 through 13) and Instructional Planning (Items 14 through 21). Factor XI (Items 44 through 46) consisted of a subset of Evaluation and Factor XII involved a single

item from each of the Instruction (Item 32) and Communication (Item 58) categories.

Based on these results, twelve scores for each respondent were computed. These scores were not factor scores in the traditional sense but the average item response to the items included in a factor. Shown below are the labels given to the 12 scores and the items included in computing the scores. These item sets are not identical to those described previously, but are the result of placing an item in one of 12 mutually exclusive subsets. The criterion used in placing an item in one of the subsets was the highest factor loading of the item. The survey instrument is found in Appendix Two.

Factor	Label	Items
I	Evaluation: General	47 through 55
II	Communication	56, 57, 59, 60, 61
III	Instruction: Structured	26 through 31
IV	Instruction: General Methodology	33 through 39
V	Behavioral Problem Management	6, 7, 8, 9, 15
VI	Classroom Administration	1, 2, 4, 5
VII	Instruction: Analysis	11 through 18
VIII	Instructional Resources	40 through 43
IX	Instruction: Innovation	22 through 26
X	Instruction: Individualized	19 through 21
XI	Testing	44 through 46
XII	Interacting with Culturally Different	32, 58

RESULTS

The most striking factor about the data was the consistency in the ratings when broken down by Teacher Assignment Level, Socioeconomic Level or Students, and Major Subject Matter. This was true for both item groupings and individual items. Results for individual items are presented in groups based on the original categories. Reference to high and low item ratings relate to the relative position of an item in its respective category.

Item Groupings

As shown in Table V (Appendix One), Behavioral Problem Management (V)

and Instruction: Individualized (X) were either highest or tied as second highest for the subgroupings. Instruction: Structured (III) and Instruction: General Methodology (IV) generally were the next highest item sets. Evaluation: General (I), Testing (XI), and Interacting with Culturally Different (XII) were consistently the lowest. Communication (II), Instructional Resources (VIII), Classroom Administration (VI), Instruction: Analysis (VII), and Instruction: Innovation (IX) usually fell in the middle of the respective distributions.

Two major deviations from these generalizations and three trends in the data should be noted. For junior high or middle school and senior high fine arts teachers, Communication (II) was the highest rated set of items. Instructional Resources (VII) was among the lowest rated skill areas for science teachers while it was among the highest for teachers of the humanities. The three trends were a decrease in Instructional Resources (VIII) over Grade Level, an increase in Testing (XI) over Grade Level and a decrease in Interacting with Culturally Different (XII) over Socio-economic Level.

One interpretation of the fine arts teachers' responses to the Communication items is that they reflect a reaction to, or perhaps fear of, the "back to basics" movement and/or trend to cut these areas when funds become scarce. The relatively low rating of the Instructional Resources by science teachers and high rating by humanities teachers is not clear, but one possibility is that teaching methodology, materials and so seem to be more standardized in the sciences than in the humanities.

The decline over Grade Level of the Instructional Resources items most likely reflects that activities covered in the items are performed less frequently by teachers of older students than teachers of younger

students. The frequency of activities might also explain the increase over years of the Testing items: teachers of older students more often develop their own tests and place more weight on them than do teachers of younger students. Also, testing instructional outcomes at higher levels might be viewed as more difficult than at lower levels. Decline in the Interacting with Culturally Different items over socioeconomic levels probably reflects the "middle classness" of teachers.

Individual Items

Evaluation (Table IV)

Six Evaluation items were rated consistently high and five were rated low. Three items (44, 45 and 46) had been included in the Testing Factor (XI) and eight (47 through 55) in the General Factor (I). High ratings of 44 and low ratings of 45 and 46 seem to indicate more of an interest in determining the appropriateness of tests than in developing them. Higher ratings of 50, 51, 52, 53 and 55 than of 47, 48 and 49 suggests that actively using test scores for evaluating and reporting is or more interest than passively working with and interpreting scores.

Communication (Table V)

Communication items receiving consistently the highest ratings were 56, 57 and 59. Lowest rated items were 60 and 61. These responses seem to indicate more interest in communication with individuals (parents and administrators) who have a direct impact on instruction than with those (government, community and so on) whose impact is more indirect.

Instruction (Table VI)

Six Instruction items were rated consistently high and five rated

consistently low. Four items (27 through 30) had been included in the Structured Factor (III) and seven (33 through 39) in the General Methodology Factor (IV). The high ratings of 29 and 30 and low ratings of 27 and 28 suggest that the interest is greater in using student information for revising instructions than in the mechanics of collecting it and using it as feedback for the student. Higher ratings of 34, 37, and 39 than of 33 and 38 suggest a greater interest in students becoming secure self-directed learners than in their development in less related non-cognitive areas. The high rating of 35 and low rating of 36 indicates an emphasis on interacting and thinking rather than on presentation of information.

Classroom Management (VII)

Five classroom management items were rated consistently high and three were rated low. Three items (1, 2 and 4) had been included in the Administration Factor (VI) and five (6, 7, 8 and 9) in the Behavioral Management Factor (V). High ratings of 2 and low ratings of 1 and 4 suggest a concern about creating a positive classroom environment rather than managing routine matters. High ratings of 6, 8 and 9 and the low ratings of 7 seem to reflect a concern about dealing with behavior problems on an individual rather than group basis.

Objectives (Table VIII)

Interest regarding objectives was related to selecting them and establishing performance levels (10 and 12). Using student information to prioritize objectives and to state them (13 and 11) was rated low. These items had been included in Instruction: Analysis Factor (VII). Items 11 and 13 were among the lowest rated items for that factor while 10 and 12 were generally in the middle.

Instructional Resources (Table IX)

Devising instructional materials and using learning centers, audio-visual aids and so on (40 and 43) were the highest rated items and using para-professional, tutors and so on (42) was the lowest rated. Consistent low ratings of item 42 most likely reflects its meaninglessness to many respondents since such personnel is not available. The downward trend over grade levels was noted previously.

Instructional Planning (Table X)

Nine Instructional Planning items were rated consistently either high or low. Four items (14, 15, 16 and 17) had been included in the Analysis Factor (VIII), three (19, 20 and 21) in the Individualizing Factor (X) and two (23 and 24) in the Innovation Factor (IX). Higher ratings of 14 and 18 than of 16 and 17 seem to indicate more concern for the conditions of teaching a task than the analysis of the task. High ratings of 19 and 20 and a low rating of 21 suggest more concern for the actual planning of individual instruction than the rationale underlying the planning.

None of the Innovation items were rated consistently high but 23 and 24 were rated low. Ratings of two other items included in the factor, 25 and 26, were consistent over the breakdown but were generally in the middle of the respective distribution. Ratings of item 22 were one instance in the study when they were not consistent for the various sample subgroups. Since this item dealt with "incorporating recent subject matter developments into the instructional process" it is not surprising that the relative ratings increased over grade level and were fairly high for junior high or middle and senior high teachers.

DISCUSSION

The two most notable outcomes of the study were the consistency of the instrument analysis with respect to the a priori item groupings and the consistency of the findings over the sample breakdowns. The former lends support to the construct validity of the instrument. The latter lends support to the notion that teachers, regardless of grade level, socioeconomic background of students taught, and subject matter area (junior high or middle and high school), generally have many similar concerns regarding types of in-service education. This seems true whether general skill areas (factors as defined in this study) or specific skills are considered. Specific content, examples and so on might vary, but the basic concepts underlying them are similar.

The findings about the general skill areas indicated most concern for managing behavior problems and in individualizing instruction. Second were two dimensions of instruction, one focusing on a highly structured approach and the second on more general methodology. Least interest was shown in evaluation and interacting with individuals with a background culturally different than the teacher. General skill areas that usually fell in the middle were: communicating with others, using instructional resources, administering the classroom, analyzing instruction and trying different instructional methodologies. Two major exceptions to these generalizations should be noted. "Using instructional resources" declined over grade level, that is, it was relatively important to lower elementary teachers and relatively unimportant to high school teachers. The second was the fine arts teachers (music, art and so on) rated communication the highest. Two trends noted were that concern about testing increased over grade level and interacting with culturally different students and

parents was more important to teachers of "mostly lower" socioeconomic students than other teachers.

Inspecting the results of individual items produced two major results. Within the item groupings the relative ratings of the skill areas were the same when broken down by the subgroups. The major deviation was that "incorporating recent subject matter developments into the instructional process" was relatively higher for teachers in the upper grades, regardless of subject matter area. The second was that there was considerable variability in the means of the items included in the factors.

After inspecting the item variabilities within the factors, the presenters feel that the data support a conclusion which is probably already recognized by organizers involved with in-service education. Teachers are pragmatic. They are more interested in knowing how to do "things" and how to use "things" than in developing the "things" themselves or the rationale for their development. A few examples supporting this conclusion are: teachers are more interested in using results of evaluation procedures than developing them; they are more interested in revising instruction based on information about students than in collecting information and providing feedback; they are more concerned about designing individualized programs than the rationale underlying the programs; and they are more concerned with conditions surrounding the student's successful completion of a task than analyzing the task itself. Also, teachers seem concerned about dealing with individual differences and are receptive to "how to" methods that focus on the individual.

One limitation of the study might be that "only" about 60% returned the questionnaire. But, perhaps, those most interested in in-service education are those who responded. A second is that the procedure for

defining the factors, unit weighting of selected items, resulted in correlated rather than uncorrelated scores. The investigators had few reservations in using the procedure since they doubted in this case that complex combinations of items resulting in uncorrelated scores are as interpretable or have as much substantive meaning. One could also question the factor labels and the interpretation given to the distribution of items within factors. These might be debatable.

The question considered most important by the investigators is that the pattern of interests might vary from corporation to corporation or school to school. A preliminary analysis of this question has been made and it seems there is some variation in the patterns. This factor, if substantiated, is very important to those involved in planning in-service programs, the implication being that it might be beneficial for a school corporation to conduct its own assessment. The intent of this report was to provide a general overview, not to deal with the specific interests in a particular school or corporation.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Joel L. Burdin, editorial, Journal of Teacher Education, 28, March-April, 1977.

[2]Roy A. Edelfelt, "In Service Education of Teachers: Priority of the Next Decade," Journal of Teacher Education, 25, February, 1974, p. 250.

[3]Louis J. Rubin, "Teacher Growth in Perspective" in Improving In Service Education, Louis J. Rubin; ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

[4]Russell M. Agne, and Edward R. Ducharme, "Rearranging the Parts: A Modest Proposal for Continuing and In Service Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 28, March-April, 1977, pp. 16-19.

[5]J. L. Brimm, and D. J. Tollett, "How Do Teachers Feel About In Service Education?" Educational Leadership(Research Supplement) 31, 1974, pp. 521-525.

[6]Gary M. Ingersoll, "Assessing Inservice Training Needs Through Teacher Responses," Journal of Teacher Education, 27, Summer 1976, pp. 169-173.

[7]Letters in parentheses indicate coding which appears in the Tables.

[8]The investigators have used fourteen factors in further analyses.

APPENDIX ONE

TABLE I.

Results of the TPE Survey - All Teachers

MEAN	Classroom Management	Objectives	Instructional Planning	Instruction	Instructional Resources	Evaluation	Communication
	ITEM NUMBER AND CATEGORY						
4.5	6						
4.4							
4.3				39			
4.2			19				
4.1	9		14,20				
4.0	2,3		15	35,37			56
3.9	8		18	30,34	40,43		57
3.8	5		22	28,29,31		55	
3.7		10	25,26	27,33	41		
3.6		12	17,21,23			44,53	59
3.5		13	24	38		50,51,52	60
3.4	1,7	11		36	42		61
3.3						54	58
3.2			16	32			
3.1	4					45,46	
3.0						49	
2.9							
2.8						47	
2.7							
2.6							
2.5						48	
2.4							
2.3							

TABLE II.

Item Loadings Greater Than .30
For Each of the 12 Related Factors*

I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Q44 39(35)	Q51 33(35)	Q26 33(31)	Q32 39(32)	Q05 32(30)	Q01 47(47)
Q45 41(36)	Q52 32(32)	Q27 54(60)	Q33 49(48)	Q06 42(41)	Q02 32(29)
Q46 44(40)	Q55 29(31)	Q28 55(60)	Q34 58(55)	Q07 43(43)	Q04 56(53)
Q47 63(66)	Q56 61(65)	Q29 56(50)	Q35 54(55)	Q08 73(73)	Q05 66(67)
Q48 69(72)	Q57 60(64)	Q30 51(46)	Q36 43(42)	Q09 75(77)	Q07 32(34)
Q49 62(62)	Q58 54(51)	Q31 54(47)	Q37 62(62)	Q15 33(33)	
Q50 55(52)	Q59 58(55)		Q38 54(54)		
Q51 55(51)	Q60 63(60)		Q39 52(53)		
Q52 42(37)	Q61 46(43)				
Q53 48(42)					
Q54 49(45)					
Q55 42(37)					

VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII
Q10 58(56)	Q40 58(59)	Q21 30(36)	Q16 18(40)	Q44 46(50)	Q32 45(70)
Q11 69(70)	Q41 58(57)	Q22 49(51)	Q17 31(54)	Q45 62(67)	Q58 39(54)
Q12 69(70)	Q42 60(59)	Q23 55(54)	Q18 39(57)	Q46 47(53)	
Q13 60(56)	Q43 50(52)	Q24 32(32)	Q19 50(43)		
Q14 36(30)		Q25 59(55)	Q20 53(46)		
Q16 48(37)		Q26 39(39)	Q21 36(38)		
Q17 49(35)					
Q18 44(31)					
Q21 30(25)					

*Decimals have been omitted.

TABLE III.

OVERALL MEANS OF THE ITEM CLUSTERS
AND A BREAKDOWN BY TEACHER ASSIGNMENT
STUDENT SOCIOECONOMIC LEVEL AND SUBJECT MATTER
ASSIGNMENT FOR JUNIOR AND SENIOR HIGH TEACHERS

OA	x	Teacher Assignment				Socioeconomic Level				Subject Matter					
		LD	UP	UR	SR	ML	LM	MM	MU	PB	SS	HM	FA	AA	OT
	4.5														
	4.4														
	4.3														
	4.2														5
	4.1	5,10													10
5,10	4.0		5,10	5		5,10	5,10		10					10	2,4
	3.9	3,8	3	10	10			5,10	5		5,10		2	4,5	
3,4	3.8	2,4	4	4	4,5	3,4,8	3,4,8	3,4	3,4	5	4	4,5,10	4,5		3,8
2,8	3.7	7,9	2,8	2,3	3	2,6	2,9	8	8,9	4,10	2,3,9	3,8	10	9,2,3,8,7	7
6,7,8	3.6	6	6,7,9	7,8,9	2,7,9	7,8	6,7	2,6,7,9	2,6,7	3	3,11	9	3,6,7	6	6,8
	3.5			6	6,8,11					2,6,9	7	2,7,11	8,9	11	12
	3.4			11		12			11	7	6	6			
1,11,12	3.3	1,12	1,11,12	12	12		1,11,12	1,11	1	8,11	1,12	1	12	1,12	1,11
	3.2			1	1	1		12	12	1			1		
	3.1					11						12			
	3.0									12			11		
	2.9	11													
	2.8														

TABLE IV.

Breakdown of the Evaluation Items

by Teacher Assignment, Student Socioeconomic Level and Subject Matter Assignment

for Junior and Senior High Teachers

	Teacher Assignment				Socioeconomic Level				Subject Matter						
	LO	UP	JR	SR	ML	IM	MM	MU	PB	SS	MM	FA	AA	OT
4.5														
4.4														
4.3														
4.2														
4.1														
4.0														
3.9	55									44				53
3.8				44	55		55	55					44,55	52
3.7	51	55	55	55		44,53,55		44,53			44	52,55	52,53	51
3.6	53	51,53	44,53	52,53	53	51	44,52,53	52	44,53,55	46,51,52,55	55	53,54	50	50.55
3.5		44,52	51,52		44,50,51	50,52	51	50,51	52	53	46,52,53	51	45,51	
3.4	44,50,52,54	50	50	50,51			50		50	45,50		50	54	44,46
3.3		45,54	45,54	45,46,54	52,54	54	54	45,54	45,51	54	50		46	54
3.2		46,49	46					46			45,51,54	44		
3.1			49			45,46	45,46		54	49		46	49	45
3.0	49			49	45,49	49	49	49	46			49		49
2.9					46						49			47
2.8	45,47	47	47	47		47			49		47	45	47	
2.7					47		47	47	47	47				
2.6	46												48	
2.5								48						48
2.4		48	48	48		48	48		48		48			
2.3	48													
2.2					48					48		47,48		

TABLE V.

Breakdown of Communication Items by Teacher Assignment, Student Socioeconomic Level and Subject Matter for Junior and Senior High Teachers

	Teacher Assignment				Socioeconomic Level				Subject Matter					
	LO	UP	JR	SR	ML	LM	MM	MU	PB	SS	HM	FA	AA	OT
4.5														
4.4														
4.3														
4.2	57													56
4.1	56											56,59		
4.0		56			56	56	56	56						59
3.9	61	57	56		57	57	57					60	56	57,60
3.8			57	56				57			56			61
3.7	59		59			59,60			56,57	56, 57,61		57	57	
3.6		59	60	57,59	59		59,60	59		59,60	60		59,60	58
3.5	60			60,61	58	61		60,61	59		57,59	61	61	
3.4	58	60,61	61		60,61		61							
3.3		58	58			58			60	58	61	58	58	
3.2				58			58	58	61					
3.1											58			
3.0									58					
2.9														
2.8														
2.7														
2.6														
2.5														

TABLE VI.

Breakdown of Instruction Items by Teacher Assignment, Student Socioeconomic Level, and Subject Matter Assignment for Junior and Senior High Teachers

	Teacher Assignment				Socioeconomic Level				Subject Matter					
	LO	UP	JR	SR	ML	LM	MM	MU	PB	SS	HM	FA	AA	OT
4.5														39
4.4	39	39												37
4.3					39	39	39					39	39	
4.2			39	39				39						35
4.1	30,37	37								39	35,39			31
4.0	29,31,34	30,35	35,37	35	37	34,35,37	35,37	34,35,37	35	34,35,37	37	34,37	34,35,37	38
3.9	35	28,29,31,34	34	37	29,30,34	28,29,30,31	30,34		39					28,29
3.8			28,30	28,30,34	28,31		29,31	28,29,30	34,37	28	30,34	28,29,35	28,29	30
3.7	27,28,33	27,33	29,31	29	33,35*	27,33	28	31,33	29,30	27,29,30,31,33	28,29,31	30,36	27,30,33,36	31,33
3.6			27,33	27,31,33,36	27		27,33	27	27,28				31,38	
3.5	38	38	38		38	38	38	36	31,33,36	38	27,33,38	33		27
3.4			36	38	32	36	36	38		36	36	27,31,38		32,36
3.3		32,36		32		32			38	32			32	
3.2	32,36		32		36		32	32				32		
3.1									32		32			
3.0														
2.9														
2.8														
2.7														
2.6														
2.5														
2.4														
2.3														

TABLE VII.

Breakdown of the Classroom Management Items by Teacher Assignment, Student Socioeconomic Level, and Subject Matter Assignment for Junior and Senior High Teachers

	Teacher Assignment				Socioeconomic Level				Subject Matter					
	LO	UP	JR	SR	ML	LM	MM	MU	PB	SS	HM	FA	AA	OT
4.5	6	6	6		6	6	6			6				6*
4.4				6				6	6		6		6	9
4.3	9											6		2
4.2	2				9	9								3,8
4.1	3,8	3,9	9		3			3						
4.0			2,3,8		2,8	2,3,8	2,3,9	2,9		3	3	2,3,8	9	
3.9	5	2	5	3	5		8	8	9	9	9	9	2,3	
3.8		5,8		2,9		5			2,5,8	2,8	2		5,8	5
3.7				8			5		3			1,5		7
3.6				5				1,5			8			1
3.5	7	7	1	1	7		1		1	5	5		1	
3.4	1	1	7		1	1,7				1	1		7	
3.3					4		7	7				7		
3.2	4	4		4,7		4	4			7			4	
3.1									4,7			4		
3.0			4					4			7			4
2.9											4			
2.8														
2.7										4				
2.6														
2.5														
2.4														
2.3														

* > 4.5

TABLE VIII.

Breakdown of the Objectives Items
by Teacher Assignment, Student Socioeconomic
Level, and Subject Matter Assignment for
Junior and Senior High Teachers

	Teacher Assignment				Socioeconomic Level				Subject Matter					
	LO	UP	JR	SR	ML	LM	MM	MU	PB	SS	HM	FA	AA	OT
4.5														
4.4														
4.3														
4.2														
4.1														
4.0														
3.9													10	
3.8				10								10,12	12	13
3.7	10		10		10	10	10	10,12		10	10			
3.6	13	10	12	12		12			10			13	11	10,12
3.5	12	12,13			12,13	13	12	13	12	12	12		13	
3.4	11		11,13	11,13		11	11,13	11			13			11
3.3		11			11					11	11	11		
3.2									11	13				
3.1									13					
3.0														
2.9														
2.8														
2.7														
2.6														
2.5														

TABLE IX.

Breakdown of Instructional Resources Items by Teacher Assignment, Student Socioeconomic Level and Subject Matter Assignment for Junior and Senior High Teachers

	Teacher Assignment				Socioeconomic Level					Subject Matter				
	LO	UP	JR	SR	ML	LM	MM	MU	PB	SS	HM	FA	AA	OT
4.5														
4.4														
4.3														
4.2	40													
4.1	43	40			40									
4.0						40	40	40						41
3.9					43	43					40,43		40,41	
3.8	41	43	40,43				43	43		41,43			43	40,43
3.7	42	41	41	40,43	41	41	41	41		40		40,41		42
3.6				41							41			
3.5		42			42	42			40,43			43		
3.4														
3.3			42				42	42			42			
3.2									41				42	
3.1				42						42				
3.0									42			42		
2.9														

TABLE X.

Breakdown of the Instructional Planning Items
by Teacher Assignment, Student Socioeconomic Level and Subject Matter
for Junior and Senior High Teachers

	Teacher Assignment				Socioeconomic Level				Subject Matter					
	LO	UP	JR	SR	ML	LM	MM	MU	PB	SS	HH	FA	AA	OT
4.5					4.5									
4.4	19				4.4									
4.3	15				4.3	19		19						14
4.2	14,20	19			4.2	20	19						19	15,20
4.1		14,20			4.1	14,15,18	14,15,20	19	20			14,19		14,20	
4.0	18	15,18	14,19,20	14,19,20	4.0		18	14,15,20	14		14,19,20,22		14	22	18,19
3.9			15,18	22	3.9			18	15,18	14,19,20	18	20	20	18,25	
3.8	25		22	15,18	3.8		22	22	22,25		15,26	15,18,22	18,19,22	15	24
3.7	17,21,22,23,24,26	21,22,23,26		25,26	3.7	17,26	21,25,26	25,26	17,23,26	15,18,22	25	23,25		17,21,26	17,21,22
3.6		17,25	17,21,23,25,26	17,21	3.6	21,23,25	17,23,24	17,21,23	21		17,21,23	17,26	15,17,25,26	23	
3.5		24	24	23	3.5	22,24				17,21,26		21	21,23	24	23,25,26
3.4					3.4			24	24	23,25	24		24		
3.3				24	3.3				16		16	24			
3.2	16	16			3.2	16	16			24				16	16
3.1			16	16	3.1			16							
3.0					3.0					16			16		
2.9					2.9							16			
2.8					2.8										
2.7					2.7										
2.6					2.6										

APPENDIX TWO

Print your name _____

Print your school corporation name _____

A. Background Information

Place the number which corresponds to the level of your major assignment on the blank to the right.
1. Lower Elementary (K-grade 3)
2. Upper Elementary (grades 4-6)
3. Junior High or Middle School
4. Senior High School

_____ (1) Grade level

Place the number which corresponds to your major subject area assignment on the blank to the right. Elementary teachers who teach most subject matter areas should not complete this item.
1. Physical, biological, and/or mathematical sciences
2. Social Sciences (history, sociology, etc.)
3. Humanities (English, foreign languages, etc.)
4. Fine Arts (arts, music, etc.)
5. Applied Arts (business, physical and industrial education, home economics, etc.)

_____ (2) Major Subject Matter Assignment

Place the number which corresponds to your sex on the blank to the right.
1. Female
2. Male

_____ (3) Sex

Print the actual number of years you have taught on the blank provided.

_____ (4) Number of Years Teaching

Print the actual number of years you have been teaching for your present school corporation on the blank provided.

_____ (5) Number of Years with Present School Corp.

Place the number which corresponds to the number of graduate hours you have completed on the blank provided.
1. 0 - 10 semester hours (0 - 15 quarter hrs.)
2. 11 - 22 semester hours (16 - 33 quarter hrs.)
3. 23 or more semester hours (34 quarter hrs.) but less than a Master's Degree
4. At least a completed Master's Degree

_____ (6) Number of Graduate Hours

Place the number which in your judgement best describes the type of students you teach on the blank provided.
1. Mostly lower socioeconomic level
2. About evenly distributed between lower and middle socioeconomic levels
3. Mostly middle socioeconomic level
4. About evenly distributed between middle and upper socioeconomic levels

_____ (7) Type of Student Body

TEACHER PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION SURVEY 26

B. Items

Items 1 through 61 are brief descriptions of skills and activities which many professionals feel are essential to effective teaching. Please respond to all the items. Many thanks for your help. You will see the results in the ADVOCATE.

Response Codes

Indicate how useful each type of additional professional training would be to you, using the code specified below.

1-Among the least useful	2-Of little use, but not among the least useful	3-Of moderate use	4-Of use, but not among the most useful	5-Among the most useful

Classroom Management

_____ 1. Behaving in a manner which is consistent with the legal rights and responsibilities of teachers.
_____ 2. Organizing the classroom environment to emphasize rewards rather than punishments.
_____ 3. Coordinating individual and group instruction and supplementary activities within the confines of scheduling constraints.
_____ 4. Maintaining classroom records to facilitate classroom management.
_____ 5. Establishing procedures to maintain an orderly class.
_____ 6. Implementing strategies to encourage positive student attitudes toward learning.
_____ 7. Determining when and how to apply group methods of discipline.
_____ 8. Analyzing the problem behaviors of students.
_____ 9. Implementing procedures to resolve individual behavior problems.

Objectives

_____ 10. Selecting instructional objectives which are relevant to long-range goals.
_____ 11. Stating instructional objectives in terms of observable student behaviors.
_____ 12. Establishing expected student performance levels for instructional objectives.
_____ 13. Using cognitive (e.g., ability and achievement) and non-cognitive (e.g., attitudinal, value, and sociological) information about students to establish priorities for goals and objectives.

Instructional Planning

_____ 14. Identifying individual and group reinforcers which can be used to motivate students.
_____ 15. Recognizing students with special cognitive (e.g., learning disabilities) or affective (e.g., emotional) problems who need the attention of school and community specialists.
_____ 16. Determining whether the learning task identified in an objective requires primarily memorization, formation of a new concept, problem solving, synthesis, etc.
_____ 17. Identifying the prerequisite skills and knowledge necessary for a student to achieve an objective.
_____ 18. Breaking down a learning task into components in order to accommodate students with different skills and abilities.

Copyright 1977 Ball State University

27

Response Codes

Indicate how useful each type of additional professional training would be to you, using the code specified below.

1-Among the least useful	2-Of little use, but not among the least useful	3-Of moderate use	4-Of use, but not among the most useful	5-Among the most useful

Instructional Planning-continued

_____ 19. Designing instructional programs to meet the individual needs of students.
_____ 20. Arranging instruction so that students can move in an orderly manner toward the achievement of an objective.
_____ 21. Applying learning principles when planning and guiding learning activities.
_____ 22. Incorporating recent subject matter developments into the instructional process.
_____ 23. Experimenting with different methods of teaching.
_____ 24. Applying knowledge of child and adolescent development when planning and guiding learning activities.
_____ 25. Using newly developed curriculum procedures and materials.
_____ 26. Evaluating the appropriateness of instructional materials (e.g., textbooks).

Instruction

_____ 27. Collecting information on a regular basis concerning student progress toward the achievement of instructional objectives.
_____ 28. Providing feedback to students on a regular basis concerning their progress toward achieving instructional objectives.
_____ 29. Using performance information to pinpoint the nature of learning difficulties.
_____ 30. Restructuring instruction when reteaching is necessary.
_____ 31. Using information about student performance to assign subsequent learning activities (e.g., remedial and sequential).
_____ 32. Interacting with students from a different social and ethnic background than yours.
_____ 33. Employing group activities to promote widespread student participation.
_____ 34. Interacting with students in ways to promote mutual understanding and trust.
_____ 35. Using techniques of questioning to encourage higher levels of student thinking (e.g., analysis, synthesis, and evaluative thinking).
_____ 36. Presenting clear and logical verbal instruction (e.g., lectures).
_____ 37. Employing procedures to encourage self-directed student behaviors.
_____ 38. Incorporating value clarification activities into the instructional process.
_____ 39. Using techniques to encourage positive student self-concepts and feelings of worth.

Instructional Resources

_____ 40. Using learning centers, audio-visual aids, television, games, and other multi-media methods to promote student learning.
_____ 41. Incorporating community facilities and resource people into the instructional process.
_____ 42. Using para-professionals, tutors, and other instructional personnel in conducting classroom related activities.
_____ 43. Devising instructional materials and activities, including remedial.

Response Codes

Indicate how useful each type of additional professional training would be to you, using the code specified below.

1-Among the least useful | 2-Of little use, but not among the least useful | 3-Of moderate use | 4-Of use, but not among the most useful | 5-Among the most useful

Evaluation

_____ 44. Selecting tests which match stated objectives.
_____ 45. Constructing objective cognitive test items (e.g., multiple-choice and matching).
_____ 46. Constructing non-objective cognitive evaluation procedures (e.g., essay items, performance assessments, and product evaluation).
_____ 47. Interpreting commercial achievement test scores.
_____ 48. Calculating normative scores such as means, medians, percentiles, stanines, etc.
_____ 49. Constructing non-cognitive assessment devices (e.g., attitudes, and values).
_____ 50. Improving present assessment devices and procedures.
_____ 51. Interpreting the results of testing and evaluation to students, their parents, and to other professionals in terms each can understand.
_____ 52. Using student feedback (e.g., opinions) to evaluate and revise instruction.
_____ 53. Using student achievement data collected throughout the instructional process to evaluate and revise instructional materials and procedures.
_____ 54. Determining whether objectives have been obtained for which performance standards cannot be set (e.g., non-cognitive objectives).
_____ 55. Devising accurate, objective methods for periodically summarizing and reporting student achievement (e.g., grades).

Communication

_____ 56. Implementing procedures to enlist parental support of your instructional program.
_____ 57. Exchanging information about students with parents on a regular basis (e.g., progress difficulties, special problems).
_____ 58. Interacting with parents from a different social and ethnic background than yours.
_____ 59. Discussing your instructional successes, needs and problems with school administrators in a non-threatening environment.
_____ 60. Communicating your goals and objectives to the public.
_____ 61. Receiving pertinent information about the activities of government, school administration, community, and professional organization(s).

Thank you for your help. Please fold this survey and place in the self-addressed, postage-free envelope and mail. Your cooperation is appreciated.

4/8/77